

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

LOREN YOUNG,)	CASE NO. 1:08 CV 1670
)	
Petitioner,)	JUDGE PETER C. ECONOMUS
)	
v.)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
KENNETH KOCHOVAR,)	<u>AND ORDER</u>
)	
Respondent.)	

On July 11, 2008, petitioner pro se Loren Young filed the above-captioned habeas corpus action under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The petition asserts that he is being held at the Cuyahoga County Jail in violation of his Ohio statutory speedy trial rights. For the reasons stated below, the petition is denied and this action is dismissed.

A federal district court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in state custody only on the ground that the custody violates the Constitution or laws of the United States. Furthermore, the petitioner must have exhausted all available state remedies. 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The issue of whether or not petitioner's rights set forth in Ohio's speedy trial statute have been violated is an issue of

state law. It is simply not the province of this court to reexamine state-court determinations on state-law questions. Estelle v. McGuire, 502 U.S. 62, 67-68 (1991).

Accordingly, the request to proceed in forma pauperis is granted, the petition is denied, and this action is dismissed pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Further, the court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Peter C. Economus 8/26/08
PETER C. ECONOMUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE